REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended, claims 5 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice, no new claims have been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing, claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-13 remain pending for reconsideration which is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been added.

The undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for the Interview conducted on January 24, 2008. As indicated in the Interview Summary, the Examiner agreed that the claims distinguish over the applied reference (Ravindranath et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,987,756). Although not mentioned in the Interview Summary record the Response filed on January 10, 2008, also included an explanation of why claim 5 also distinguishes over Ravindranath et al. Those comments are incorporated therein.

However, the Examiner asserted, at the Interview, that page 19, lines 27-29 of WO 99/14932 (hereinafter "Thomas") disclose the features of claim 1.

In response to this assertion, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part:

> receiving at the gateway device from the switched-circuit communication network a circuit-oriented connection setup message with destination address information identifying the communication destination;
>
> evaluating at the gateway device the destination address information; and
>
> determining at the gateway device, based on the destination address information, a choice relating to further connection setup between the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains

(claim 1, lines 11-17). It is submitted that neither Ravindranath et al. nor Thomas, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1.

Thomas is directed to a gatekeeper that authorizes Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) communications between a source gateway and a destination gateway in a wide area network comprising distributed computers (see Thomas, page 1, lines 21-24). According to Thomas, the gatekeeper receives a request message from the source gateway requesting authorization to complete a communication between a calling party and a called party via the IP network (see Thomas, page 7, lines 32-35). In response, the gatekeeper determines whether to authorize the communication by inquiring whether at least one of the destination gateways is available to receive the communication (see Thomas, page 7, line 35 to page 8, line 2).

Claim 1, in contrast, requires that the gateway device "evaluat[e] the destination address information; and determin[e] ... a choice relating to further connection setup between the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains" upon "receiving ... a circuit-oriented connection setup

message with destination address information identifying the communication destination". Thomas does not teach or suggest such features because Thomas is merely concerned with the gatekeeper determining whether to authorize the requested communication based on the availability of the destination gateways rather than the gateway device "determining ... based on the destination address information, a choice relating to further connection setup between the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains" as in claim 1. Therefore, the determination being made in Thomas is not the same as the determination made in claim 1.

Furthermore, it is submitted that nothing in Ravindranath suggests modification of Thomas to overcome this deficiency. Therefore, it is submitted that neither Thomas nor Ravindranath, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above-mentioned features recited in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Thomas and Ravindranath.

The last five lines of claims 6 and 10 recite a connection controller to receive from the switched-circuit communication network a circuit-oriented connection setup message with destination address information identifying a communication destination, to evaluate the destination address information and to make a selection affecting further connection setup between the Voice over Internet Protocol network domains based on evaluation of the destination address information. Therefore, claims 6 and 10 are patentable over Thomas and Ravindranath, taken alone or in combination, for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Further, the dependent claims 2-4, 7, 8 and 11-13 are patentable over Thomas and Ravindranath, taken alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims 1, 6 and 10.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 10, 2008

By: /Sheetal S. Patel/
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501